# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/750,565	12/31/2003	Peter W. Gaudet	0100.1361-026	5725	
21005 7:	590 03/20/2006		EXAMINER		
HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.			JIANG, CH	JIANG, CHEN WEN	
530 VIRGINIA	ROAD				
P.O. BOX 9133			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CONCORD, MA 01742-9133			3744		
•			DATE MAILED: 03/20/2000	DATE MAILED: 03/20/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/750,565	GAUDET ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Chen-Wen Jiang	3744				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app		correspondence address				
Period for Reply	VIO OET TO EVOIDE AMOUTU	(O) OR THIRTY (OO) DAYO				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of the second period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute the Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed  the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 D	ecember 2003.					
,	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
c) are easyest to resimenent arts of	,					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>31 December 2003</u> is/a						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correc						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	a)-(d) or (f).				
a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		ed in this National Stage				
application from the International Burea  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list		ed				
See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	eu.				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
<ul> <li>2) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>3) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20040823,20041028</li> </ul>		Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/750,565 Page 2

Art Unit: 3744

### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1-3,8-10 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Grant et al. (EP 0233784).

Grant et al. disclose pressure gauge for monitoring pump pressure. The gauges includes Pirani or thermocouple gauges. The control unit conventionally incorporates protection circuits, which prevent the gauge from being switched on if the dangerous condition such as temperature and pressure. Under the principals of inherency, if a prior art device, in its normal and usual operation, would necessarily perform the method claimed, then the method claimed will be considered to be anticipated by the prior art device. When the prior art device is the same as a device described in the specification for carrying out the claimed method, it can be assumed the device will inherently perform the claimed process. *Ir re King*, 801 F.2d 1324, 231 USPQ 136 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/750,565 Page 3

Art Unit: 3744

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 4. Claims 4-7,11-14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grant et al. (EP 0233784) in view of Bachler et al. (U.S. Patent Number 4,757,689).

Grant et al. disclose pressure gauge for monitoring pump pressure. The gauges includes Pirani or thermocouple gauges. The control unit conventionally incorporates protection circuits, which prevent the gauge from being switched on if the dangerous condition such as temperature and pressure. In regard to claims 4-7 and 11-14, Bachler et al. disclose the pressure gauge is used on cryopump and the using on different pump is intended use and is not patentable. Bachler et al. disclose the inert gas is not a dangerous condition. In regard to claim 15, using interlock in the gauge is well known in the prior art to protect the gauge. In regard to the dangerous temperature set at 20K, it is a design choice. Upon a close review of applicant's specification, it appears that the claimed temperature does not have any criticality and/or lead to any new and unexpected results. Applicant does not specify the deficiencies of other temperature used in the prior art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have selected the claimed temperature for the safety setting in the control stage since these particular temperature provide control calculations that are no better or provided improved performance over that which is commonplace in the prior art.

Application/Control Number: 10/750,565

Art Unit: 3744

# **Double Patenting**

Page 4

5. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 6. Claims 1-14 and 16 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 3,4,14,15,16,17 and 18 of U.S. Patent No. 6,755,028. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because '028 claims the system and method of cryopump comprising determining a potentially dangerous condition and preventing a thermocouple gauge from being turned on. The conditions include a temperature set point and cryopump been purged.
- 7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chen-Wen Jiang whose telephone number is (571) 272-4809. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00 to 6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cheryl Tyler can be reached on (571) 272-4834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chen-Wen Jiang Primary Examiner